11:Faron E-5 (1952-1954)1961 SG4 Araucanians SG4
Mapuche

the stability of local residential groupings throughout the colonial and early republican periods.

By the 1850's there was increased colonization of the southern part of central Chile. Several towns were also built near and along the Pacific coast south of Concepción. Nueva Imperial was founded in 1852 and Toltén in 1867. South of Villarrica and Valdivia a number of settlements were also established. In this same period the provinces of Arauco and Llanquihue were created. Through immigration from Europe and the northern provinces of Chile white population increased to more than 100,000 by the end of the nineteenth century in this part of Chile. The greatest impetus to colonization came after the War of the Pacific and after the pacification of the Mapuche. McBride described the settlement of Araucanía in these words: "Small blocks of territory, chiefly in the foothills of the Andes and in the deeper forests, still harbored clusters of Indian families who clung to their native speech, apparel, and customs. But white settlement was spreading. New provinces were created: Bío Bío in 1875, Malleco and Cautín in 1887—thus the whole of the Frontera was incorporated into the national domain" (1936:295–96). I might add that large blocks of Mapuche continue to live in the Central Valley on land now cleared of forest. With the establishment of reservations, the Mapuche were effectively brought under the administration of the national government and were influenced by its political and legal systems.

It is my feeling that most if not all the speculative reconstructions of prereservation political organization have to be dismissed, largely because the early chroniclers and even the more sophisticated ethnographers of the late nineteenth century saw Mapuche social and political organization in terms of European models founded on territorial units which seem to have no basis in fact. Cooper (1946), from whom the following excerpts are taken, gives an unbiased appraisal of the historical material on military and political organization:

> Some major features of the system . . . are quite clear. There was no peacetime over-all chief, no centralization of authority. . . . Furthermore, such authority as was invested in kinship heads and local "chiefs" was very limited—exclusively or almost exclusively consultative and persuasive, with little or no coercive power. They had no recognized rights to inflict punishment, to claim tribute or personal service, or to demand obedience from their kinsfolk or "subjects." The latter paid no attention to them and did as they pleased if the leaders showed themselves arrogant or domineering [704].